the people are willing to take up the work themselves, the amount will be handed over to them.

74. Certain pressing needs of the Pattanamtitta Taluk.

Mr. Kurien Unnittan (Member, Pattanamtitta Taluk) represented that the establishment of a Munsiff's court was one of the most pressing needs of the Pattanamtitta taluk. The litigant public of the locality had been moving for this court from 1079. When in 1080 the High Court contemplated the separation of a portion of the area within the jurisdiction of the Tiruvalla Munsiff's court owing to the heavy arrears of work of that court and to take it on to Chengannur or Pattanamtitta and to open an additional court in any one of the places best suited for it, a deputation from Pattanamtitta waited on the Judges of the High Court and submitted their grievances which were sympathetically heard; but unfortunately Chengannur was preferred to Pattanamtitta. As the latter had no treasury at the time two additional courts were established, one at Mavelikara and the other at Adur with a view to reduce the volume of work in the Kottarakara and Krishnapuram courts. The court at Adur did not justify its existence as the volume of work was very small. The Member suggested that it might be shifted to Sastamkotta with certain portions of the Karunagapalli taluk brought under its jurisdiction and that a new court might be established at Pattanamtitta with jurisdiction over the Pattanamtitta taluk and some *pakuthies* of the Kunnattur and Chengannur taluks. This new court would be of much help to the people of Ranni, Kumpazha, Pattanamtitta, Elantur, Mallappuzhasseri, Cherukole, Omallur, Vallikode, Koduman, Pantalam Vadakkekara and Pantalam Tekkekara. The Member pointed out that at present they had to take their cases to the courts at Chengannur and Adur, the distance to the former being 40 miles and to the latter 28 miles.

To the Member who brought forward this subject at the seventeenth session of the Assembly, the Dewan gave a reply stating that the Additional Munsiff's Court established at Kottarakara would be transferred to Pattanamtitta as soon as the arrears in the Kottarakara Munsiff's Court were finished; but, subsequently, that order was cancelled and it was decided that the additional court should be transferred to Perumpavur and that there was no need for a Munsiff's Court at Pattanamtitta. This, the Member observed, was a source of sore disappointment to the people of Pattanamtitta. He, therefore, prayed that the said additional court be established at Pattanamtitta in conformity with the first order.

The Member next spoke about the need for a hospital at Ranni. The nearest hospitals at Kozhancheri, Koni and Kanjirapalli were situated at a distance of 24, 20 and 18 miles respectively. The roads leading to those institutions were not in proper order and considerable inconvenience was experienced in consequence. The need for a hospital at Ranni was moved at the fourteenth session of the Assembly. The Member regretted that, while there were medical institutions within short distances of each other in other places, it was a pity that Ranni which was a mountainous place subject to malarial fever and other diseases had none. He, therefore, prayed for the early establishment of a hospital at Ranni.

The last representation of the Member related to means of communication. The Member said that, if two bridges were constructed, one over the Kumbazha river and the other over the Ranni river, easy and direct communication between Trivandrum and the High Range could be established and the circuitous route now taken to Peermade *via* Kottayam could be avoided. He, therefore, prayed for the construction of the two bridges referred to.

Dewan's reply.—The establishment of a Munsiff's Court is a matter in which the High Court have to be consulted. The representation made on the subject at the last session of the Assembly was forwarded to the High Court, and the High Court

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

said in reply that, when the work of the Additional Munsiff's Court at Kottarakara was over, the question of transferring that court to Pattanamtitta might be considered. There is no doubt that the intention of the High Court was to transfer the court to Pattanamtitta as soon as the arrears in the Munsiff's Court at Kottarakara were cleared. Two months later, however, the High Court wrote to say that there was greater necessity for transferring that court to Perumpavur, and they have now said that there is no need for a court at Pattanamtitta. The opinion of the High Court must prevail in this matter.

As regards the dispensary at Ranni, the Darbar Physician's reply has not been received. As soon as it is received, the matter will be considered.

In regard to the bridge, yours is one of the taluks which I have not yet inspected. I mean visiting it some time in July and, when I go there, I shall see the condition of the taluk for myself. I shall then also decide whether a dispensary should be established at Ranni.

75. Means of communication in the Tiruvalla Taluk with special reference to the pakuthies comprised in Group II.

Mr. Idikkala Eappen (Member, Tiruvalla Taluk) prayed for the construction of a bridge at the eastern end of the Tiruvalla-Kozhancheri road and stated that the expenditure that would be incurred on the bridge might be recouped by the establishment of a toll gate. He then gave detailed statistics regarding several subsidiary roads opened by the people, especially the Kallupara road where a bridge was necessary, and said that the temporary bridge sanctioned would not be useful, and that Government should take up those roads for maintenance as that would be an incentive to the people of other parts of the State to open similar roads. He next urged the necessity for the formation of a separate board for the investigation of those roads and for a discussion of the draft rules *in re* ryots' roads. Lastly, the Member requested the Dewan to inspect the locality to satisfy himself as to the need for the improvement of the roads under reference.

Dewan's reply.—You have taken great trouble to collect statistics regarding private roads cut by the ryots. I mean to go to Kozhancheri when I next visit Ranni, and I shall then inspect the Kaviyur bridge.

In regard to private roads, your taluk has, I admit, set an example to other taluks. Government also are doing what they can to help you. Only some days ago we took over 31 miles of private roads in addition to such roads taken over already. People should open as many roads as possible, and Government also should help them. It is not possible to spend money for the construction of roads in the several taluks according to any absolute rule of proportion. The suggestion that Government should spend money on roads and recoup themselves by levying tolls is not a very helpful one. It will take 40 or 50 years to recover the amount spent.

The draft rules *in re* ryots' road have been now before the public for sometime, and their criticisms have been received by the Government. I shall consider the question whether a conference should be called for before passing them finally.

Member.—What about the temporary bridge on the road opened by us before these rules were framed?

Dewan.—You refer, I presume, to the Kallupara iron bridge. You have not given notice of this subject beforehand. An estimate has to be prepared.

As regards the other work you have referred to, the Chief Engineer says that the estimate has to be revised and that he is going to inspect the work.

Rev. Father K. J. Kuriakose (Member, Nominated) represented that the portion of the Tiruvalla Market canal, opened last year, was so narrow and meandering that steam and motor boats could not pass through it and that it was necessary that the portion of the canal from Chantakkadavu to Pallithodu should be improved by widening it and removing a few of the bends.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly